

Supplement

Table S1. Features of alert systems in included studies (n=18)

Authors	Vital signs	Nursing assessments	Lab results	Medications	Clinical calculators	Demographics	Data collection	Calculation frequency
Bailey et al ¹	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Manual	Continuous
Bedoya et al ²	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Mixed	Continuous
Bellomo et al ³	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Mixed	Unknown
Danesh et al ⁴	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Manual	Hourly
Duncan et al ⁵	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Manual	4 hourly
Escobar et al ⁶	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Automated	Hourly
Evans et al ⁷	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Mixed	Every 5 minutes
Fletcher et al ⁸	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Manual	Every 5 minutes
Fogerty et al ⁹	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Automated	Continuous
Giuliano, K. ¹⁰	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Automated	Continuous
Heal et al ¹¹	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Manual	4 hourly
Heller et al ¹²	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Mixed	12 hourly (MEWS=0), 4-6 hourly (MEWS between 1-4),

									hourly (MEWS between 5-6), every 15 minutes (MEWS>=7)
Jones et al ¹³	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Manual	Unknown baseline, but hourly for MEWS ≥ 3	
Kollef et al ¹⁴	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Manual	Continuous	
Mestrom et al ¹⁵	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Mixed	Daily (0), 8 hourly (1), 4 hourly (2), hourly + consult (3), hourly + consult + potentially call RRT (4)	
Parrish et al ¹⁶	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Mixed	Continuous	
Subbe et al ¹⁷	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Mixed	Minimum 12-hourly up to 6- hourly	
Weller et al ¹⁸	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Automated	Continuous	

Table S2. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	Title page
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	2-3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	3-4
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	4
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	4-5
Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	4-5
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	4
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	5
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	5
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	5
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	N/A



SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	5
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	8
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	8-14
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	N/A
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	8-14
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	8-14
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	15-16
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	16
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	17
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	Title page

JBI = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social mediaplatforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

From: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169:467–473. doi: [10.7326/M18-0850](https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850).



St. Michael's
Inspired Care.
Inspiring Science.

References

1. Bailey TC, Chen Y, Mao Y, et al. A trial of a real-time alert for clinical deterioration in patients hospitalized on general medical wards. *8*(5):236-242.
2. Bedoya AD, Clement ME, Phelan M, Steorts RC, O'Brien C, Goldstein BA. Minimal Impact of Implemented Early Warning Score and Best Practice Alert for Patient Deterioration. *47*(1):49-55.
3. Bellomo R, Ackerman M, Bailey M, et al. A controlled trial of electronic automated advisory vital signs monitoring in general hospital wards. *40*(8):2349-2361.
4. Danesh V, Neff D, Jones TL, et al. Can proactive rapid response team rounding improve surveillance and reduce unplanned escalations in care? A controlled before and after study. *2019*;91:128-133.
5. Duncan KD, McMullan C, Mills BM. Early warning systems: the next level of rapid response. *2012*;42(2):38-45.
6. Escobar GJ, Liu VX, Schuler A, Lawson B, Greene JD, Kipnis P. Automated Identification of Adults at Risk for In-Hospital Clinical Deterioration. *383*(20):1951-1960.
7. Evans RS, Kuttler KG, Simpson KJ, et al. Automated detection of physiologic deterioration in hospitalized patients. *22*(2):350-360.
8. Fletcher GS, Aaronson BA, White AA, Julka R. Effect of a Real-Time Electronic Dashboard on a Rapid Response System. *42*(1):5.
9. Fogerty RL, Sussman LS, Kenyon K, et al. Using System Inflammatory Response Syndrome as an Easy-to-Implement, Sustainable, and Automated Tool for All-Cause Deterioration Among Medical Inpatients. *2019*;15(4):e74-e77.
10. Giuliano KK. Improving Patient Safety through the Use of Nursing Surveillance. *51*:34-43.
11. Heal M, Silvest-Guerrero S, Kohtz C. Design and Development of a Proactive Rapid Response System. *35*(2):77-83.
12. Heller AR, Mees ST, Lauterwald B, Reeps C, Koch T, Weitz J. Detection of Deteriorating Patients on Surgical Wards Outside the ICU by an Automated MEWS-Based Early Warning System With Paging Functionality. *271*(1):100-105.
13. Jones S, Mullally M, Ingleby S, Buist M, Bailey M, Eddleston JM. Bedside electronic capture of clinical observations and automated clinical alerts to improve compliance with an Early Warning Score protocol. *13*(2):83-88.
14. Kollef MH, Chen Y, Heard K, et al. A randomized trial of real-time automated clinical deterioration alerts sent to a rapid response team. *9*(7):424-429.
15. Mestrom E, De Bie A, Steeg MV, et al. Implementation of an automated early warning scoring system in a surgical ward: Practical use and effects on patient outcomes. *2019*;14(5):e0213402.
16. Parrish WM, Hravnak M, Dudjak L, Guttendorf J. Impact of a Modified Early Warning Score on Rapid Response and Cardiopulmonary Arrest Calls in Telemetry and Medical-Surgical Units. *Medsurg Nurs*. *2017*;26(1):15-19.
17. Subbe CP, Duller B, Bellomo R. Effect of an automated notification system for deteriorating ward patients on clinical outcomes. *21*(1):52.
18. Weller RS, Foard KL, Harwood TN. Evaluation of a wireless, portable, wearable multi-parameter vital signs monitor in hospitalized neurological and neurosurgical patients. *32*(5):945-951.